Solar neutrinos, helicity effects and new affine gravity with torsion II.

David Alvarez-Castillo[1],* Diego Julio Cirilo-Lombardo [2],† and Jilberto Zamora-Saa [3‡]
[1] *Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, Moscow Region, Russian Federation.*
[2] *Universidad de Buenos Aires, Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Cientificas y Tecnicas (CONICET), National Institute of Plasma Physics (INFIP), Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Ciudad Universitaria Buenos Aires 1428, Argentina.*
[3] *Dzhelepov Laboratory of Nuclear Problems, , Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, Moscow Region, Russian Federation.*

The cross section for neutrino helicity spin-flip obtained from a new $f(R,T)$ model of gravitation with dynamic torsion field introduced by one of the authors in [1], is phenomenologically analyzed. To this end, due to the logarithmical energy dependence of the cross section, the relation with the axion decay constant f_a (Peccei-Quinn parameter) is used. Consequently the link with the phenomenological energy/mass window is found from the astrophysical and high energy viewpoints. The highest helicity spin-flip cross-sectional values presented in this work coincide with a recent estimation on the axion mass computed in [2] in the framework of finite temperature extended lattice QCD and under cosmological considerations.

PACS numbers:
Keywords: neutrinos, gravitation, torsion fields, axions.

arXiv:1611.02137v2 [hep-ph] 10 Nov 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

In the previous paper [1] we have shown that the interaction $\gamma^\alpha j\frac{1-d}{d}\gamma_5 h_\alpha$, where h_α is the torsion axial vector, j is a parameter of pure geometrical nature, and d is the spacetime dimension, produces a mechanism of spin-flip that is extremely important in the massive neutrino case. Hence, we have calculated explicitly the cross section for this process, obtaining:

$$\sigma_\nu^{flip}(\beta)=\left(\frac{j\mu mc}{4\hbar}\right)^2\left(\frac{(1-d)^2}{\pi^2 d}\right)^2\frac{4E^2}{(E+mc^2)^2}\left[1.09416+Ln\left(\frac{2\left(E^2-m^2c^4\right)}{q_{\min}^2}\right)\left(Ln\left(\frac{2\left(E^2-m^2c^4\right)}{q_{\min}^2}\right)-0.613706\right)\right] \quad (1)$$

with j and μ universal model dependent parameters, carrying units of inverse electromagnetic field and magnetic momentum respectively (e.g. $\mu\equiv\zeta\mu_B$, ζ =constant). As we have aforementioned in [1], this cross section, in sharp contrast with the string theoretical and standard model cases, depends logarithmically on the energy, even at high energies. Notice that this cross section generalizes in some sense the computation of reference [3]. It is important to mention that the impact of torsion in High Energy Physics is becoming important for high energy precision experiments [4] and moreover could be studied in future dump beam experiment as SHIP [5] and accelerator as ILC [6].

The aim of this letter is to complete the previous work, by means of analyzing from the phenomenological and theoretical viewpoints. Therefore, here we study the above cross section, going beyond the solar neutrino case and considering the possibility of neutrino oscillations (NOs) and other feasible astrophysical scenarios.

As is well known, the cross section energy dependence is important when considering neutrinos detected experimentally, because the number of events naturally depends on the energy threshold. In our manuscript we focus on the case of neutrinos endowed with non-standard interactions, making it evident due to the presence of the torsion as dynamical field, in particular the relation between the dual of the torsion field as the gradient of the axion field, namely $h_\alpha\sim\nabla a$.

The organization of this paper is as follows: in Section II we recall some of the results of ref [1]. In Section III, the phenomenological implications of the torsion field computed before [1] with respect to the neutrino oscillation are given. In sections IV and V, the correction to the interaction vertex produced by the torsion field is compared with the experimental values and the bounds to the universal parameters of the model are established. In section VI the window of energies (in the Peccei Quinn sense) the relation of the masses of the interacting fields and and possible scenarios are presented. Finally in Section VII we summarize the obtained results.

*Electronic address: alvarez@theor.jinr.ru
†Electronic address: diego777jcl@gmail.com, diego@theor.jinr.ru
‡Electronic address: jzamorasaa@jinr.ru

II. CROSS-SECTION

As we can see, for the explicit cross-section formula Eq. (1), first derived in ref [1], it is important to note the following:

1. In Eq. (1), if we assume some astrophysical implications (see refs in [1]), the logarithmic terms can be bounded with values between 1 and 6, depending on screening arguments, as generally accepted. This situation of taking the logarithmic energy dependent terms to be constant is at present questioned by the experimental point of view due to the arguments given in the Introduction.

2. The j parameter plays formally (at the cross section level) a role similar to that of the constant κ of the string model with torsion. However in our approach, it is related to some physical "absolute field" (as b in the Born-Infeld theory), giving the maximum value that the physical fields can take into the space-time (just as the speed of light c in the relativity theory). In such a case j ("the absolute field") will be fixed to some experimental or phenomenological value.

3. The above results can straightforwardly be applied not only to the solar neutrino case, but also to other physical scenarios, involving astrophysical neutrinos, dark matter, supernovae, etc.

III. PHENOMENOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE MODEL

In the original version of the standard model (SM), leptons are grouped in three families or flavors:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu_\alpha \\ \alpha \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ e \end{pmatrix}; \begin{pmatrix} \nu_\mu \\ \mu \end{pmatrix}; \begin{pmatrix} \nu_\tau \\ \tau \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2}$$

While the charged leptons are massive (these get their masses via Higgs mechanism [7]) neutrinos are not. In the middle of 60s, terrestrial experiments observed a discrepancy between the number of neutrinos predicted by solar theoretical models and measurements of the number of neutrinos passing through the Earth; this discrepancy was called "the solar neutrino problem" (SNP) [8]. A natural explanation for the SNP came from the NOs phenomenon [9] which allows the flavor transmutation during neutrino propagation into the space. Neutrino oscillations was confirmed by experiments and have shown that neutrinos have non-zero masses ($m_i \sim 1$ eV) [10, 11]. The existence of massive neutrinos opens a new window concerning the nature of neutrinos, Dirac or Majorana. While Dirac neutrinos preserve the lepton number, Majorana ones violate it by two units. Furthermore, if neutrinos are Dirac particles, right handed ones (sometimes called steriles) are essential in order to construct the Dirac mass term $\overline{\nu}_L m_\nu \nu_R$ [12]. On the other hand, if they are Majorana particles, the mass term will be $\overline{\nu}_L m_\nu \nu_L$ and consequently, the two way to introduce such gauge invariant term are: via higher dimensional operators (HDOs) [13] and spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB). It is important to note that HDOs are not renormalizable and can be understood as an effective theory where particles with masses $M \gg M_W$ have been integrated out. However, in this section we will pay our attention on the effects of Torsion field over the flavor neutrino oscillation.

Let's define the flavor eigenstates, which have a defined flavor α

$$|\nu_\alpha\rangle = \sum_i^n B_{\alpha i} |\nu_i\rangle, \tag{3}$$

here $B_{\alpha i}$ are elements of unitary mixing matrix (PMNS-matrix) and $|\nu_i\rangle$ are the mass eigenstates, which have a defined mass m_i. The temporal evolution of the mass (or flavor) eigenstate is lead by Schroedinger equation

$$\underbrace{i\frac{d}{dt}|\nu_i(t)\rangle = \hat{H}_m|\nu_i(t)\rangle}_{\text{Mass Basis}} \quad ; \quad \underbrace{i\frac{d}{dt}|\nu_\alpha(t)\rangle = \overbrace{\hat{B}\cdot\hat{H}_m\cdot\hat{B}^\dagger}^{\hat{H}_f}|\nu_\alpha(t)\rangle}_{\text{Flavor Basis}}, \tag{4}$$

where $\hat{H}_m$ ($\hat{H}_f$) is the Hamiltonian in the mass (flavor) basis. The evolved (in time) states $|\nu_i(t)\rangle$ and $|\nu_\alpha(t)\rangle$ are

$$|\nu_i(t)\rangle = e^{-i\hat{H}_m t}|\nu_i\rangle \quad ; \quad |\nu_\alpha(t)\rangle = e^{-i\hat{H}_f t}|\nu_\alpha\rangle. \tag{5}$$

In presence of torsion-field the free Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0$ will be modified by an extra $\hat{H}_T$ term, as follow:

$$\hat{H}_m = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} E_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & E_2 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & E_n \end{pmatrix}}_{\hat{H}_0} + \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} T_{11} & T_{12} & \dots & T_{1n} \\ T_{21} & T_{22} & \dots & T_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ T_{n1} & T_{n2} & \dots & T_{nn} \end{pmatrix}}_{\hat{H}_T}. \tag{6}$$

Due to the fact that neutrinos masses are very small ($m_i \ll E_i$), these can be treated as relativistic particles, thus neutrino energy E_i can be expressed as:

$$E_i = \sqrt{m_i^2 + |\vec{p}_i|^2} \approx |\vec{p}_i| + \frac{m_i^2}{2|\vec{p}_i|}. \tag{7}$$

If neutrino are heavier (non relativistic), as in the case of heavy-sterile flavor NOs, the momenta of the two mass eigenstate are slightly different from each other, therefore the Eq.(7) should be treated in a different way (see [14] for a deepest discussion). However, since in this letter we will take care only of the phenomenological aspects, then the relativistic expression suffices. On the other hand, and in order to have a easy phenomenological discussion, we will pay attention to scenarios with only two neutrino families ($n = 2$); in such a case the rotation matrix of $SU(2)$ becomes our mixing matrix

$$\hat{B} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & \sin\theta \\ -\sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{pmatrix}. \tag{8}$$

Furthermore, $\hat{H}_m$ can be written in terms of Pauli matrices in order to use the group theory artillery:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_f \equiv \hat{B} \cdot \hat{H}_m \cdot \hat{B}^\dagger = \left(E_\nu + \frac{m_1^2 + m_2^2}{4E_\nu} + \frac{T_{11} + T_{22}}{2} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{2\times 2} \\ - \tilde{\Delta} m_D^2 \cdot \left(\sin 2\theta \ \hat{\sigma}_1 - \cos 2\theta \ \hat{\sigma}_3 \right) + T_{12} \cdot \left(\sin 2\theta \ \hat{\sigma}_3 + \cos 2\theta \ \hat{\sigma}_1 \right). \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Here $T_{ii} \sim \frac{\mu_{ii}}{r^2}$, where μ_{ii} is the neutrino magnetic moment. It is important to remark that μ_{ii} is a 2×2 matrix, however we will pay our attention only in the diagonal terms μ_{11} and μ_{22} (we will assume $T_{12} = 0$) in order to estimate the impact of torsion over flavor NOs. Regarding the $\tilde{\Delta} m_D^2$ parameter, it can be understood as an "effective" squared mass difference and is given as

$$\tilde{\Delta} m_D^2 \equiv \left(\frac{\delta m_{21}^2}{4E_\nu} + \frac{T_{22} - T_{11}}{2} \right) \simeq \left(\frac{m_2^2 - m_1^2}{4E_\nu} + \frac{\mu_{22} - \mu_{11}}{2r^2} \right). \tag{10}$$

It is important to note that the first term in Eq.(9) will not be relevant for the NOs probabilities, due to the fact that it can only contribute with a global phase. In order to calculate the transition probabilities we define the flavor eigenstates ($t = 0$) in matrix form as

$$|\nu_\alpha\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad |\nu_\beta\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{11}$$

By mean of Eqs.(5,8,9,11) we can write the flavor[1] state as

$$|\nu_\alpha(t)\rangle = \left(\cos \tilde{\Delta} m_D^2 t - i \sin \tilde{\Delta} m_D^2 t \ (\hat{\sigma}_1 \sin 2\theta - \hat{\sigma}_3 \cos 2\theta) \right) |\nu_\alpha\rangle. \tag{12}$$

In consequence, the probability to measure the state $|\nu_\beta\rangle$ at a distance L from the source, is given by

$$P(\nu_\alpha \to \nu_\beta) = |\langle \nu_\beta | \nu_\alpha(t = L/c) \rangle|^2 = Sin^2(2\theta) \ Sin^2 \left(\frac{\tilde{\Delta} m_D^2 \ L}{C} \right). \tag{13}$$

---

[1] In Eq.(12) we have used the Euler's formula to cast the exponential into the binomial form.

In order to estimate the energy scale, in which torsion could play a relevant role in flavor NOs, we should compare the terms present in Eq.(10) and impose the next condition

$$\frac{\delta m_{21}^2}{4E_\nu} \sim \frac{\mu}{2r^2} \Rightarrow E_\nu \sim \frac{\delta m_{21}^2 r^2}{2\mu}. \tag{14}$$

We already know from neutrino experiments that $\delta m_{21}^2 \approx 7.59 \times 10^{-5}$ eV^2 and $\mu \leq 10^{-11}\mu_B \sim 10^{-19}$ eV^{-1}. If we choose a $r \sim 10$ km as in supernova cores [15] we require an unrealistic energy E_ν. On the other hand, if heavy neutrinos exist, these could have bigger magnetic moments which depend on the value of the sterile-neutrino mass (in some specific models) and have been calculated in [16], discussed in [17], and their values presented in figure 1. Thus, for heavy neutrinos the condition in Eq.(14) becomes

$$\frac{m_2^2 - m_1^2}{4E_\nu} \sim \frac{\mu_{22} - \mu_{11}}{2r^2} \Rightarrow E_\nu \sim \frac{4\sqrt{2}\pi^2 r^2 (m_1 + m_2)}{e\ G_F}, \tag{15}$$

which requieres energy in the GUT scale. However, there exist models where the neutrino magnetic moment does not depend on the neutrino masses, such as $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)$ (left-right symmetric models) with direct right-handed neutrino interactions (see [18, 19]). In such a case the condition in Eq (14) becomes

$$E_\nu \sim \frac{(m_2 - m_1)(m_1 + m_2) r^2}{4\mu}. \tag{16}$$

This last condition implies that the torsion could become important in scenarios where the heavy neutrinos are almost degenerate ($m_2 - m_1 \sim 0$). For instance, in scenarios of resonant CP violation [20–24], it is found that

$$m_2 - m_1 \sim \Gamma_N \propto |B_{\ell N}|^2 \frac{G_F^2 M_N^5}{192\pi^3}, \tag{17}$$

where $|B_{\ell N}|^2$ are the heavy-light neutrino mixings (for which $|B_{\ell N}|^2 \lll 1$) and G_F is the Fermi constant. Moreover, this quasi-degeneracy is fundamental in scenarios that aim at explaining the baryon asymmetry of the universe via leptogenesis [25, 26].

IV. ANOMALOUS MOMENTUM AND BOUNDS

With these considerations in mind, it is important to derive the anomalous momentum for the electron. Specifically, from the second order Dirac type equation [27], one gets the correction to the lepton anomalous momentum in the form

$$\Delta a_e = \left(\frac{j\mu_B mc^4}{4\hbar^2 G}\right)\left(1 - \frac{1}{d}\right). \tag{18}$$

The experimental precision in measurement of this quantity is [28]

$$\Delta a_e^{\exp} = 0.28 \times 10^{-12}, \tag{19}$$

and then the upper bound for the universal field-geometric parameter[2] j is

$$j < \frac{4\hbar^2 G}{\mu_B mc^4}\left(\frac{d}{d-1}\right) 0.28 \times 10^{-12}. \tag{20}$$

Therefore, in 4-dimensions, we have as maximum limit for j

$$j < 1.39 \times 10^{-69}\left(\frac{e}{m^2}\right)^{-1}\left(= 0.867665 \times 10^{-50}\left(\frac{C}{m^2}\right)^{-1} = 0.29 \times 10^{-55}\left(\frac{esu}{cm^2}\right)^{-1}\right). \tag{21}$$

Notice that it is an enormous value that gives a maximum bound for the absolute field $j^{-1} = 3.45 \times 10^{55}\ \left(\frac{esu}{cm^2}\right)$. It is also useful to remark that in classical Born-Infeld theory [29] (or superstring theoretical models) the absolute field value is around $b \simeq 3.96718 \times 10^{15} esu/cm^2$. However, the enormous magnitude of this absolute b field justifies the application of the Maxwell's equations in their classical form in all cases (in classical Born-Infeld theory or in GUT superstring-brane related), except those where the inner structure of the electron is concerned (fields of the order b, distance or wavelength of order r_e).

---

[2] notice the role of the Planck length in the maximum value of j

V. TORSION FIELD AND AXION INTERACTION

The particle physics phenomenology suggest that many symmetries of the nature are spontaneously broken, implying the existence of new particles, called Nambu-Goldstone bosons. Within this context, astrophysical objects, like stars or supernovae, can potentially play the role of high energy particle-physics laboratories. In [1] we presented a *concrete relation* between the axial vector h_α and the axion field a; furthermore, it was presented the interaction term $L_1 \approx \frac{C_f}{2f_a}\overline{\psi}_f\gamma^\alpha\gamma_5\partial_\alpha a\psi_f$, where ψ_f is a fermion field, C_f a model-dependent coefficient of order unity and f_a the Peccei-Quinn energy scale related to the vacuum expectation value[3] (for a more detailed discussion of the interplay between torsion and axion fields, see [30–32] and the references therein). On the other hand, within our unified gravity-model, the interaction coming from the resulting Dirac equation is:

$$L_{int} \approx \overline{\psi}_f \frac{1-d}{d} j\gamma^\alpha\gamma_5 h_\alpha \psi_f, \tag{22}$$

therefore, the above interaction is related with L_1 provided that

$$\partial_\alpha a \sim h_\alpha \quad and \quad \frac{C_f}{2f_a} \sim \frac{1-d}{d} j. \tag{23}$$

In addition, C_f serves to define an effective Yukawa coupling of the form $g_{af} \equiv \frac{m_f C_f}{2f_a}$. Relations in Eq. (23) establish the phenomenological link between torsion and vector/axion will be used for the phenomenological analysis in section VI.

VI. ASTROPHYSICAL NEUTRINOS, OSCILLATION AND POSSIBLE SCENARIOS

In order to study cross section values we look into the parameter space of f_a, m_ν at different energy values. We adopt the form of the lepton magnetic moment of a hypothetical heavy Dirac neutrino as studied in [16, 17, 33]:

$$\mu_\nu = \frac{eG_F m_\nu}{8\sqrt{2}\pi^2}\begin{cases} 3+\frac{5}{6}b, & m_\ell \ll m_\nu \ll M_W, \\ 1, & m_\ell \ll M_W \ll m_\nu, \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

where $b = \frac{m_\nu^2}{M_W^2}$ and M_W is the W boson mass. The axion decay constant f_a values used in this work range from 10^3-10^{12} eV and are in agreement with [34], where a detailed discussion of astrophysical and cosmological limits is presented. For instance, in the early universe time, hot axions are expected to decouple after the QCD epoch if $f_a \lesssim 3\times10^7$ GeV; on the other hand, neutron star axion cooling constraints suggest that $f_a > 10^8$ GeV [35].



FIG. 1: Neutrino magnetic moment dependence on mass.

[3] The spontaneously broken chiral Peccei-Quinn symmetry $U_{PQ}(1)$ provides an axion field with a small mass $m_a = 0.60\ eV\frac{10^7\ GeV}{f_a}$.

Moreover, a very interesting case is the SN 1987A pulse duration, where axion emission might play a major role, by shortening the width of the pulsation. Energetic emissions are characterized by values of the axion-nucleon Yukawa coupling g_{aN}. Free streaming results from low g_{aN} values, whereas for higher g_{aN} values emission corresponds to nucleon Bremsstrahlung and is shortened until it reaches a minimum, matching to the axion mean free path of the order of size of the SN core. Furthermore, the highest g_{aN} range will result into axion trapping and shall be eventually emitted from the so called "axion sphere". It is only after the axions move beyond the neutrino sphere when the supernova signal becomes again unaffected. Strongly coupled axions might interact with in-falling matter from the supernova explosion and might lead to γ ray emissions as well [36]. Under the framework of the DFSZ model [37], white-dwarf cooling via axion-electron interaction is feasible for similar range of axion parameters to the supernova case, $f_a \gtrsim 10^9$ GeV. Thus, it is of great interest to explore the impact of axion parameter values, namely the axion decay constant, to the neutrino helicity spin-flip cross sectional values. Figure 2 shows the resulting cross sections as a function of the neutrino energy E_ν for a set of fixed mass plots. In addition, each line represents a chosen value of the axion decay constant f_a. The general trend is that the larger the neutrino masses the larger the cross section values. The cross section seems to be more dramatically dependent on the axion decay constant, presenting the same behavior as for the mass dependence. In figure VI the neutrino energy is fixed where as the mass becomes the free parameter. The result is the same, the f_a parameter plays a mayor role in the determination of cross section values.



FIG. 2: *Set of figures for the cross section dependence on the neutrino energy featuring a fixed neutrino mass value.* In each plot m_ν is fixed whereas each line represents a given f_a. Both the mass and axion decay constant have a direct influence on the cross section values.



FIG. 3: *Set of figures for the cross section dependence on the neutrino mass featuring a fixed neutrino energy value.* In each plot E_ν is fixed whereas each line represents a given f_a. Both the energy and axion decay constant have a direct influence on the cross section values, similar to the case of a fixed neutrino mass value.

Moreover, it is worth noticing that a recent estimation on the axion mass has been computed in [2] in the framework of finite temperature extended lattice QCD and under cosmological considerations. The result is a value of the axion mass in the range of micro-eV, corresponding to a range of 10^{12} GeV $< f_a < 10^{14}$ GeV, favoring the highest helicity spin-flip cross-sectional values presented in this work.

VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS AND OUTLOOK

In this report, the cross section for neutrino helicity spin-flip obtained from a new $f(R,T)$ model of gravitation with dynamic torsion field introduced by one of the authors in [1], was phenomenologically analyzed. To this end, due the logarithmical energy dependence of the cross section, the relation with the axion decay constant f_a (Peccei-Quinn parameter) was used. Consequently, the link with the phenomenological energy/mass window is found from the astrophysical and high energy viewpoints. The important point is that, in relation with the torsion vector interaction Lagrangian, the f_a parameter gives an estimate of the torsion field strength that can variate with time within cosmological scenarios [38, 39], potentially capable of modifying the overall leptogenesis picture.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

D.J. Cirilo-Lombardo is grateful to the Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics-JINR and CONICET-ARGENTINA for financial support and to Andrej B. Arbuzov and Peter Minkowski for discussion and insights. Jilberto Zamora-Saa was supported by Fellowship Grant *Becas Chile* N°74160012, CONICYT.

References

[1] D. J. Cirilo-Lombardo, Astropart. Phys. **50-52**, 51 (2013), 1310.4924.
[2] S. Borsanyi et al., Nature **539**, 69 (2016), 1606.07494.
[3] H.Bethe, Proc. Camb. Philol. Soc. **31**, 108 (1935).
[4] O. Castillo-Felisola, C. Corral, S. Kovalenko, and I. Schmidt, Phys. Rev. **D90**, 024005 (2014), 1405.0397.
[5] S. Alekhin et al., Rept. Prog. Phys. **79**, 124201 (2016), 1504.04855.
[6] O. Castillo-Felisola, B. Diaz Saez, F. Rojas, J. Zamora-Saa, and A. R. Zerwekh (2015), 1504.02037.
[7] G. Bhattacharyya, Rept. Prog. Phys. **74**, 026201 (2011), 0910.5095.
[8] J. N. Bahcall and M. H. Pinsonneault, Rev. Mod. Phys. **64**, 885 (1992).
[9] B. Pontecorvo, Sov. Phys. JETP **6**, 429 (1957), [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.33,549(1957)].
[10] Y. Fukuda et al. (Super-Kamiokande), Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1562 (1998), hep-ex/9807003.
[11] K. Eguchi et al. (KamLAND), Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 021802 (2003), hep-ex/0212021.
[12] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 912 (1980).
[13] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 1566 (1979).
[14] G. Cvetic, C. S. Kim, R. Kogerler, and J. Zamora-Saa, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 013015 (2015), 1505.04749.
[15] H.-T. Janka, K. Langanke, A. Marek, G. Martinez-Pinedo, and B. Mueller, Phys. Rept. **442**, 38 (2007), astro-ph/0612072.
[16] M. Dvornikov and A. Studenikin, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 073001 (2004), hep-ph/0305206.
[17] A. Studenikin, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **188**, 220 (2009), 0812.4716.
[18] M. Czakon, J. Gluza, and M. Zralek, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 013010 (1999).
[19] J. E. Kim, Phys. Rev. **D14**, 3000 (1976).
[20] J. Zamora-Saa and G. Moreno (2016), 1606.08820.
[21] G. Cvetic, C. Dib, C. S. Kim, and J. Zamora-Saa, Symmetry **7**, 726 (2015), 1503.01358.
[22] G. Cveti, C. S. Kim, and J. Zamora-Sa, Phys. Rev. **D89**, 093012 (2014), 1403.2555.
[23] G. Cveti, C. S. Kim, and J. Zamora-Sa, J. Phys. **G41**, 075004 (2014), 1311.7554.
[24] C. O. Dib, M. Campos, and C. S. Kim, JHEP **02**, 108 (2015), 1403.8009.
[25] A. Pilaftsis and T. E. J. Underwood, Phys. Rev. **D72**, 113001 (2005), hep-ph/0506107.
[26] A. Pilaftsis and T. E. J. Underwood, Nucl. Phys. **B692**, 303 (2004), hep-ph/0309342.
[27] S. Capozziello, D. J. Cirilo-Lombardo, and A. Dorokhov, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **53**, 3882 (2014), 1404.1459.
[28] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. **D16**, 1791 (1977).
[29] D. J. Cirilo Lombardo, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **48**, 2267 (2009), 0906.3636.
[30] O. Chandia and J. Zanelli, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 7580 (1997), hep-th/9702025.
[31] S. Mercuri, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 081302 (2009), 0902.2764.
[32] O. Castillo-Felisola, C. Corral, S. Kovalenko, I. Schmidt, and V. E. Lyubovitskij, Phys. Rev. **D91**, 085017 (2015), 1502.03694.
[33] M. S. Dvornikov and A. I. Studenikin, J. Exp. Theor. Phys. **99**, 254 (2004), hep-ph/0411085.
[34] G. G. Raffelt, Lect. Notes Phys. **741**, 51 (2008), [,51(2006)], hep-ph/0611350.
[35] A. Sedrakian, Phys. Rev. **D93**, 065044 (2016), 1512.07828.
[36] G. Raffelt and D. Seckel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 2605 (1991).
[37] A. R. Zhitnitsky, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **31**, 260 (1980), [Yad. Fiz.31,497(1980)].
[38] D. J. Cirilo-Lombardo, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **49**, 1288 (2010).
[39] D. J. Cirilo-Lombardo, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **50**, 3621 (2011).